

### REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, 11, 13, and 15 stand rejected and claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, and 16 are objected to. By this Amendment, claims 1, 5, 9, and 13 have been amended. The amendments made to the claims do not alter the scope of these claims, nor have these amendments been made to define over the prior art. Rather, the amendments to the claims have been made for cosmetic reasons to improve the form thereof. In light of the amendments and remarks set forth below, Applicants request reconsideration of the rejections and respectfully submit that each of the pending claims is in immediate condition for allowance.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in dependent claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, and 16. For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully submit that claims the are also patentable over the prior art of record, for the reasons discussed below.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,597,427 ("Katsu") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,512,565 ("Lee"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify a reference or combine references to arrive at the claimed subject matter. The prior art references must also teach or suggest all the limitations of the claim in question. See, M.P.E.P.

§ 706.02(j). A reference can only be used for what it clearly discloses or suggests. See In re Hummer, 113 U.S.P.Q. 66 (C.C.P.A. 1957); In re Stencel, 4 U.S.P.Q.2d 1071, 1073 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Here, the references, whether taken individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the invention claimed by the Applicants.

Among the limitations in each of the independent claims not present in the cited references is a plurality of address marks formed on said transparent substrate, each of said address marks being adjacent to and connected to one of said bus lines.

In Katsu, as shown in Figure 5, the address marks are formed directly on the gate lines, data lines, or display electrodes. Alternately, the address marks or ID numbers are shown adjacent to the opening portions of the respective pixel regions. As shown in Figure 5, the ID numbers are not adjacent to and connected to the bus lines. As such, Katsu fails to disclose the explicitly recited limitation of the address marks being adjacent to and connected to the bus lines.

Lee was not included to disclose the deficiency in Katsu discussed above but for its disclosure of a common electrode line for transmitting common signals to the counter electrode in an IPS-type display device. Whether or not this feature is disclosed in Lee is irrelevant as Lee fails to cure the deficiency in Katsu discussed above. As such, Applicants respectfully request a notice of allowance of all the pending claims.

Rejected claims 3, 7, 11, and 15 depend from and include all the limitations of the allowable independent claims. These dependent claims also recite

additional limitations which, in combination with the limitations of the allowable independent claims, are neither disclosed nor suggested by Lee and are also directed towards patentable subject matter. Thus, claims 3, 7, 11, and 15 should also be allowed.

Applicants have responded to all of the rejections and objections recited in the Office Action. Reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance for all of the pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

If the Examiner believes an interview would be of assistance, the Examiner is welcome to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Dated: January 6, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By

Ian R. Blum

Registration No.: 42,336

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &  
OSHINSKY LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas - 41st Floor  
New York, New York 10036-2714

(212) 835-1400

Attorney for Applicants

IRB/mgs